



# COPS Manual

Community Oriented Policing Services

[www.usdoj.gov/cops/](http://www.usdoj.gov/cops/)

## POLICE EXECUTIVE RESEARCH FORUM

National Problem-Solving Partnerships Evaluation

Part II

Response/Assessment Survey

June 1999

## Survey Instructions

This survey is designed to collect information about the Response and Assessment phases of your Problem-Solving Partnership Project. The information you supply in this survey will be combined with other information you have provided, such as the *COPS Problem-Solving Partnerships Report on Response* and PERF's *Scanning/Analysis Survey*.

If you have not yet completed the Assessment portion of your project, please wait to fill out this survey until you have done so. If you need to wait to fill out this survey, please complete and fax the attached form on page 20 to Bruce E. Kubu at 202.466.7826 as soon as possible to let him know your expected date of completion. A fax cover sheet is not necessary.

If a particular question does not seem relevant, please write "not applicable" next to the question. In addition, please feel free to attach any documentation about your agency's efforts that you feel would contribute to your responses. The information you provide will be used to prepare documents designed to help other agencies (as well as your own) in pursuing future problem-solving projects. Your responses will be used to advance the practice of community policing and problem solving across the nation.

### **Please return completed surveys to:**

Bruce E. Kubu  
(Re: Problem-Solving Partnerships R/A Survey)  
Police Executive Research Forum  
1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 930  
Washington, D.C. 20036

**by Friday, December 31, 1999**

**(regular mail is fine; there is no need to return your survey via priority mail, even if you are running late)**

If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Bruce E. Kubu via phone (202.466.7820, Ext. 240) or e-mail ([bkubu@PoliceForum.org](mailto:bkubu@PoliceForum.org)).



## National Problem-Solving Partnerships Evaluation Response/Assessment Survey

ORI #: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Project Status

Which of the following stages best describes the current status of your project?  
(Check only one)

- ☐ Response:   \* We are implementing a tailored set of actions that will address the most important analysis findings and have a long-term impact on the problem, **and**  
                  \* We are focusing on at least two of the following: preventing future occurrences by deflecting offenders, protecting likely victims; or making crime locations less conducive to problem behaviors.

**[If you checked “Response,” please fill out this survey *after* you have completed the Assessment phase; refer to the Survey Instructions on page one for more information.]**

- ☐ Assessment:   \* We are measuring the impact(s) of the responses on the crime/disorder problem using systematically collected data from multiple sources *after* the responses have been implemented and comparing these impact measures to data collected *before* the responses were implemented.



**Section I: Response Phase Summary**

1. After your agency conducted its analysis, what steps did it take to prepare to implement the response (e.g., provided special training to officers; met with specific agencies)?

---

---

---

---

---

---

2. What response(s) did your agency use to address its problem?

*(Check all that apply)*

- ☐ Collaboration with public agencies
- ☐ Collaboration with private agencies
- ☐ CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)
- ☐ Educating the community
- ☐ Legislative remedies/increased regulation (statutes, ordinances, etc.)
- ☐ Mediation/negotiation
- ☐ Use of civil law
- ☐ Mobilizing the community
- ☐ Targeting problem locations
- ☐ Targeting those most affected by the problem
- ☐ Targeting those most responsible for causing the problem
- ☐ Other *(Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_)*

3. Did your agency encounter difficulties during response implementation?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No **(Please skip to Q5)**



4. If you answered “yes,” did any of these difficulties require that your department return to a previous step of the problem-solving process? In other words, did these problems cause your agency to redefine its problem or collect additional information about the problem?

☐ Yes (*Please describe:* \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_)

☐ No

5. Were sworn personnel involved in the response?

☐ Yes

☐ No (**Please skip to Q8**)

6. If sworn personnel were involved in the response, did this require them to work overtime?

☐ Yes

☐ No

7. Were the sworn personnel assigned to the project, or did they volunteer?

☐ Assigned

☐ Volunteer

☐ Other (*Please describe:* \_\_\_\_\_)



8. What outside resources were available to implement the response (e.g., donated materials; monetary contributions)?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Section II: Assessment Phase Summary

Please answer the following questions **with input from your project evaluator**.

1. What data collection methods/sources did you use to evaluate your response?  
(Check all that apply)

**Police Data (Check all that apply)**

- ☐ Calls for service      ☐ Incident reports      ☐ Arrest reports

**Surveys/Questionnaires (Check all that apply)**

- ☐ Residential      ☐ Business      ☐ Environmental

**Direct observation (Check all that apply)**

- ☐ Locations/environment      ☐ Victims      ☐ Offenders

**Control/Comparison Group (Check all that apply)**

- ☐ What data was compared? (Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_) )

- ☐ What groups were compared? (Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_) )

- ☐ Anecdotal evidence  
☐ Case study  
☐ Community meetings/focus groups  
☐ Crime analysis data (other than calls for service, incident reports and arrest reports)  
☐ Media attention  
☐ Meetings with other agencies (Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)  
☐ Time series analysis  
☐ Victim/offender interviews  
☐ Mapping (spatial displacement)  
☐ Other (Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_)



2. Attached is an evaluation strategy chart similar to the one you filled out for COPS when you began your project. The chart asks you to list:

1. the outcome measures you used to evaluate the effectiveness of your PSP project (e.g., decreased citizen fear);
2. the sources of information you used to arrive at those outcome measures (e.g., citizen telephone surveys);
3. the dates of your baseline data collection (prior to response implementation);
4. the dates over which a response was actually implemented;
5. the dates of your impact data collection (post response); and
6. the impact the response had on the problem (e.g., problem increased, decreased, stayed the same, moved to another location, etc.)

If more space is necessary, please copy the chart and attach it to your completed survey.







a. Outcome measure(s)	b. Source(s) of information	c. Dates of base-line data collection (mm/yy to mm/yy)	d. Dates of response implementation (mm/yy to mm/yy)	e. Dates of impact data collection (mm/yy to mm/yy)	f. Impact of response on problem
[Example]  Number of repeat locations being vandalized by graffiti in the target area.	[Example]  94 Police incident reports pre-response  65 Police incident reports post-response	[Example]  12/97 B5/98	[Example]  6/98 - Present	[Example]  1/98-6/98	[Example]  Number of Repeat Locations decreased from 10 to 6



a. Outcome measure(s)	b. Source(s) of information	c. Dates of base-line data collection (mm/yy to mm/yy)	d. Dates of response implementation (mm/yy to mm/yy)	e. Dates of impact data collection (mm/yy to mm/yy)	f. Impact of response on problem

3. From what your agency learned during its assessment, what might it have done differently to increase the effectiveness of the response plan?

---

---

---

---

---

4. Sometimes, police departments assessing a particular response find that they have simply moved the problem to a different location rather than eliminating it altogether (e.g., displacement). Does your agency have any evidence that this is in fact what occurred?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No (**Skip to Q8**)

5. **If you answered “yes,”** please detail the reasons you believe that the problem has been displaced.

---

---

---

---

---

6. Was the problem intentionally displaced?

- ☐ Yes  
☐ No

7. Did the problem occur in the displaced location more or less often than in the problem location originally chosen?

- ☐ More often  
☐ Less often



8. Were there any specific responses you implemented that did not appear to work?

☐ Yes

☐ No (**Skip to Q10**)

9. **If you answered “yes,”** please describe these responses and explain you think they did not work.

---

---

---

---

---

10. Did you experience any unexpected benefits as a result of your response? (e.g., Residential burglary was targeted and it decreased. Unexpectedly, commercial burglary in the target area also decreased.)

☐ Yes

☐ No (**Skip to Q12**)

11. **If you answered “yes,”** please describe these benefits:

---

---

---

---

---

12. Did you experience any unexpected problems as a result of your response? (e.g., Residential burglary was targeted and it decreased. Unexpectedly, commercial burglary increased.)

☐ Yes

☐ No (**Skip to Q14**)



13. If you answered “yes,” please describe these problems:

---

---

---

---

---

14. Is your agency planning to maintain the results achieved by the response?

☐ Yes

☐ No (**Skip to Q16**)

15. If you answered “yes,” please explain how your agency is going to do this:

---

---

---

---

---

16. Overall, do you feel your PSP strategy was successful in addressing the problem?  
Why or why not?

---

---

---

---

---



17. What advice would you give to other agencies trying to use the problem-solving approach to address the problem you worked on?

---

---

---

---

---

18. Do you plan to use the problem-solving tools you have learned or utilized for other problems within your community? Why or why not?

---

---

---

---

---

19. **If you answered “yes,”** to what other problems will you apply the problem-solving technique?

---

---

---

---

---



### Section III: Participant Roles

1. What were the evaluator's specific responsibilities throughout this project?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ Collect data
- ☐ Attend meetings
- ☐ Develop survey/interview instruments
- ☐ Develop overall evaluation strategy
- ☐ Report evaluation findings
- ☐ Other (Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_)

2. What were the community's specific responsibilities throughout this project?  
(Check all that apply)

- ☐ Collect data
- ☐ Analyze data
- ☐ Attend meetings/focus groups
- ☐ Participate in surveys
- ☐ Develop response strategy
- ☐ Develop evaluation strategy
- ☐ No role established yet
- ☐ Other (Please describe: \_\_\_\_\_)



## **Section IV: Problem-Solving Project Summary**

Attach a 2-3 page summary (single-spaced) of your Problem-Solving Project. Please describe your project under the four subheadings of Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment. Feel free to provide a longer summary of your project if needed. See the example on pp. 16-17 of this survey for guidance.





## Section V: Contact Information

Agency name: \_\_\_\_\_

Street address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person's name and title: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number: \_\_\_\_\_ Fax number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

**Thank you for completing this survey.**



## Example of Project Summary

### Excerpt from COPS Tips: Problem-Solving Tips (p. 19)

Gainesville, Fla.  
Callahan, Patrick T.  
Convenience Store Robberies: An Intervention  
Strategy by the City of Gainesville, Florida.  
City of Gainesville, Florida

#### **“Change in Evening Staffing Policies Reduces Robberies of Gainesville, FL, Convenience Stores by 82 percent”**

##### Scanning

In the spring of 1985, the city of Gainesville experienced what seemed to be an exceptionally large number of convenience store robberies.

##### Analysis

Because the police did not keep automated records specifically on convenience store crime at that time, department personnel manually searched through five years worth of files to obtain more information about the problem. From this effort, the police determined that 45 of the 47 convenience stores located in Gainesville had been robbed at least once between 1981 and 1986. They also learned that although convenience stores accounted for only 18 percent of business establishments such as fast-food stores, motels/hotels, service stations and liquor stores, they accounted for 50 percent of business robberies. Many of the 45 convenience stores had been robbed repeatedly: nearly half had been robbed five or more times, and several had been robbed at least 10 times.

The police also learned other important facts that provided them with insight into the conditions that facilitated the robberies. They found that 75 percent of the convenience store robberies took place between the hours of 7 p.m. and 5 a.m.; only one clerk was present in 92 percent of the robberies; and the robber waited until the clerk was alone in 85 percent of the robberies.

To obtain more information about the problem of convenience stores generally, Gainesville officials contacted the International City Managers Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Convenience Stores, the National Criminal Justice Reference Service and several other national organizations. From these inquiries, they learned that several municipalities had passed ordinances requiring convenience stores to implement a variety of crime prevention policies. The effectiveness of these local laws varied.

The most successful ordinance, adopted in Kent, Ohio, required the convenience industry to post two clerks in stores between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m. Three



years after the Kent ordinance was passed, convenience store robberies in that community had decreased 74 percent. To determine whether having two clerks on duty might prevent robberies in Gainesville, officials analyzed the robbery rates of two local stores that operated within 100 yards of each other but had different staffing policies. They found that the store that consistently had two clerks on duty on a 24-hour basis had never been robbed, while the competing store, which was always staffed by only one clerk, had been robbed 11 times. The Gainesville police chief then asked a researcher at the University of Florida to corroborate the department's conclusions about convenience store robberies in Gainesville. From interviews with 65 convenience store robbers imprisoned in Florida, the researcher confirmed that one of the most desirable characteristics of a potential robbery site was that only one clerk would be on duty. (The only characteristic rated more desirable was "easy access/get-away" to and from the robbery site).

### Response

Following their analysis of the problem, Gainesville city officials worked with representatives of the convenience store industry for approximately one year to institute policies that would reduce the robberies. During this period, the industry suggested developing voluntary compliance crime prevention policies, but these policies did not materialize. In particular, the convenience store industry resisted instituting a two-clerk policy. Two public hearings were held by the city to gain community input on how the problem should be addressed.

In July 1986, the Gainesville City Commission passed an ordinance that required stores to provide a clear outside view of their cash register areas, post large signs informing customers that stores used drop safes and limited the cash available to clerks, and train employees who work evening shifts in robbery prevention. At the request of the convenience store industry, a two-clerk policy was not mandated by the law. Rather, a resolution was attached to the legislation stipulating that unless the convenience store industry could reduce robberies at least 50 percent during the 240 days following passage of the law, a two-clerk requirement would be imposed. Convenience store robberies increased 130 percent during the next 240 days, and the two-clerk policy was implemented in Gainesville in the spring of 1987.

### Assessment

Robberies of Gainesville convenience stores declined 82 percent between 1986, when there were 61 robberies, and 1993, when there were 11. The number of serious injuries related to convenience store robberies also was greatly reduced. Between 1981 and 1986, there was one homicide and 18 serious injuries; between 1987 and 1993, there were no homicides and only one serious injury.

This example illustrates the use of the SARA model and features a response linked to comprehensive problem analyses. The COPS Office is not promoting a particular set of responses to problems and acknowledges that there is room for disagreement regarding the responses selected and their relative impact.



## Paperwork Reduction Act

The COPS Office tries to create forms and instructions that are accurate and easily understood. The public burden for this form is estimated to average a total of 55 minutes per respondent, including the time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining the information needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. The COPS Office welcomes your comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this form, including suggestions for reducing this burden. Send comments to: COPS Office, PPSE Division, 1100 Vermont Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20530, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project: OMB No. 1103-0056, Washington, DC 20503.

OMB Number: 1103-0056

Expiration Date: 4/19/99

Respondents are not required to respond to this information collection unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.



## Fax

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**To:           Bruce E. Kubu, Research Associate**  
**Police Executive Research Forum (PERF)**  
**202.466.7826 (Fax)**

From: \_\_\_\_\_  
          (Contact Person's Name)

of the: \_\_\_\_\_  
          (Agency Name and ORI Number)

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_

My agency has not yet completed the assessment portion of its *Problem-Solving Partnerships* project. We anticipate that we will complete our assessment and return PERF's Response/Assessment Survey to you by \_\_\_\_\_.





## FOR MORE INFORMATION:

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services  
1100 Vermont Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20530

To obtain details on COPS programs, call the  
U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 1.800.421.6770.

Visit the COPS internet web site:  
[www.usdoj.gov/cops](http://www.usdoj.gov/cops)

